REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request consideration of the subject application as amended herein. This Amendment is submitted in response to the Final Office Action mailed June 28, 2006. Claims 1-32 stand rejected. In this Amendment, claims 1, 5, 6, 20, 23-24, and 31 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-32 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shannon, (U.S. Patent No. 6,233,618, hereinafter "Shannon"), in view of Brandt (U.S. Patent No. 5,892,905, hereinafter "Brandt"). As discussed below, the pending claims are patentable over the above references.

Shannon discloses an access control technique to limit access to information available on the Internet. Shannon uses a network-walker which "continually surfs the web and examines Internet content providers to gather newly found URL's and IP addresses of web servers or other content providing computers" (Shannon, col. 10, lines 2-6). Content referenced by a newly found URL or IP address is then examined to determine its restriction category, which is stored in an access control database. When a packet with a content request is received from a client, a network device uses the access control database to determine whether the destination of the content request is a restricted web site. If so, the network device denies access to the restricted web site (Shannon, col. 13, line 52 through col. 14, line 41).

Accordingly, Shannon at most discloses searching contents of databases of a network device, and not contents of multiple data storage media of a client device as required by the presently claimed invention. Furthermore, Shannon discloses denying a client's access to a restricted web site. The Examiner asserts that "the act of denying access" is an equivalent of "[T]the notification to the system." However, even assuming that the act of denying access is an equivalent of a notification, in Shannon such a notification is provided to the **client**. In the

presently claimed invention, in contrast, a notification is sent to a server.

The Examiner acknowledges that "Shannon is silent with respect to the plurality of data storage media being of a client device" (Office Action, page 3) and cites Brandt for such teaching. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Brandt provides a common user interface for a software application accessed via the Internet. A software application runs on a web server computer system. The Examiner refers to Brandt's portion stating "client workstation 210 and web server computer system 220 may be the same physical and/or logical computer system" (Brandt, col. 6, lines 3-7). Based on this statement, the Examiner concludes that "[S]since the client and server can be the same physical and logical system, the data storage medium being searched must also be located within the client" (Office Action, page 3). Applicant respectfully disagrees. The claim language recites that a client device and a server communicate via a network. Hence, the client and the server are independent devices. In addition, applicant has amended the claims to specify that a client device is an independent personal computing device.

Accordingly, neither Shannon nor Brandt, taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest searching contents of multiple data storage media of a client device for pre-selected data, and sending a notification of a detection to a server upon detecting at least a portion of the pre-selected data on any of the multiple storage media, where the client is an independent personal computing device. These limitations of the present invention are included in the following language of claim 1:

> ... searching contents of a plurality of data storage media of a client device for pre-selected data, the client device being an independent personal computing device; and
>
> upon detecting at least a portion of the pre-selected data on any one of the plurality of data storage media of the client device, sending a notification of detection of the pre-selected data to a server via a network.

Similar language is also included in independent claims 20, 31 and 32. Accordingly, the present invention as claimed in independent claims 1, 20, 31 and 32, and their corresponding dependent claims, is patentable over the cited references.

Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) and submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT AUTHORIZATION

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any charges that may be due. Furthermore, if an extension is required, then Applicant hereby requests such extension.

If the Examiner determines the prompt allowance of these claims could be facilitated by a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact Marina Portnova at (408) 720-8300.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: September 28, 2006

Marina Portnova
Reg. No. 45,750

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300